The Suffragist

VOL. VII. No. 22

FIVE CENTS

OFFICIAL WEEKLY ORGAN OF
THE NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY

SATURDAY, JUNE 7, 1919

Drawn for The Suffragist by Frederick Van Loon

The Order of the Day

National Woman's Party

(Incorporated, 1913)

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS, 14 JACKSON PLACE, LAFAYETTE SQUARE, WASHINGTON, D. C., Tel. Franklin 7120

BRANCH HEADQUARTERS

Delaware, 17 East 7th Street, Wilmington. *Tel. Wilmington* 5580

District of Columbia, 14 Jackson Place, Lafayette Square, Washington, D. C. *Tel. Franklin* 7120

Louisiana, 325 Carondelet St., New Orleans

Maryland, 817 N. Charles Street, Baltimore. *Tel. Mt. Vernon* 3279

Massachusetts, 9 Park Street, Boston. Tel. Haymarket 4048

New Jersey, 709 Union Building, Clinton Street, Newark *Tel. Market* 3117

New York, 13 East 41st Street, New York. *Tel. Murray Hill* 5444

Pennsylvania, 213 Penfield Building, Philadelphia. *Tel. Filbert* 5652

OBJECT: TO SECURE AN AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION ENFRANCHISING WOMEN

MEMBERSHIP: Open to all women who, regarding woman suffrage as the foremost political issue of the day, support it irrespective of the interests of any national political party.

ENTRANCE FEE: Twenty-five cents. There are no dues.

National Executive Committee

Miss Alice Paul, *Chairman*
Miss Mabel Vernon, Del., *Secretary*
Miss Mary Gertrude Fendall, Md., *Treasurer*
Mrs. Abby Scott Baker, D. C.
Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont, N. Y.
Mrs. John W. Brannan, N. Y.
Miss Lucy Burns, N. Y.
Mrs. Gilson Gardner, D. C.
Mrs. Thomas N. Hepburn, Conn.
Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.
Mrs. Donald R. Hooker, Md.
Mrs. Henry G. Leach, N. Y.
Mrs. Lawrence Lewis, Pa.
Miss Doris Stevens, Neb.
Mrs. Richard Wainright, D. C.
Miss Maud Younger, Cal.

National Committee of State Chairmen

Chairman, Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles

Secretary, Miss Mary Ingham

Arkansas
Mrs. Edward M. Jarrett
Batesville

California
Mrs. Genevieve Allen
117 Tenth St.
San Francisco

Colorado
Mrs. Bertha W. Fowler
1225 Wood Ave., Colorado Springs

Connecticut
Mrs. Thomas N. Hepburn
356 Laurel St.
Hartford, Conn.

Delaware
Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles
17 East 7th Street, Wilmington

District of Columbia
Miss Sheldon Jackson
14 Jackson Place
Washington, D. C.

Florida
Miss Helen Hunt
417 West Church St.
Jacksonville
Mrs. A. Travers Ewell (Chairman Campaign Committee)
153 Powell Place, Jacksonville

Idaho
Mrs. Marcella Pride
Boise

Illinois
Mrs. Lola Maverick Lloyd
362 Hawthorne Lane
Winnetka

Indiana
Mrs. W. C. Bobbs (Acting)
1610 N. Delaware St.
Indianapolis

Iowa
Miss Florence Harsh
(Legislative Chairman)
Hubbell Bldg.
Des Moines

Kansas
Mrs. Lilla Day Monroe
909 Harris St., Topeka

Kentucky
Miss Cornelia A. Beach
428 South 1st St., Louisville

Louisiana
Mrs. E. J. Graham
7025 Freret St., New Orleans

Maine
Mrs. Robert Treat Whitehouse
108 Vaughan Street, Portland

Maryland
Mrs. Donald R. Hooker
817 North Charles St., Baltimore

Massachusetts
Mrs. Agnes Morey
9 Park Street, Boston

Michigan
Mrs. Nelson Whittemore
2967 West Grand Boulevard
Detroit

Minnesota
Mrs. A. R. Colvin, Davern Ave.
St. Paul

Mississippi
Mrs. N. D. Goodwin
Gulfport

Nebraska
Mrs. W. E. Hardy
(Member Advisory Council)
Calvert Place,
R. F. D., Lincoln

New Hampshire
Mrs. Winfield Shaw
2324 Elm St., Manchester

New Jersey
Mrs. J. A. H. Hopkins
709 Union Building, Clinton St.
Newark

New Mexico
Mrs. Arthur A. Kellam
707 South Arno St.
Albuquerque

New York
Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont
13 East 41st St., New York City
Mrs. John Winters Brannan (acting)
137 E. 66th St.

North Carolina
Mrs. E. St. Clair Thompson
Spruce Pine
(present address Hotel Colonial
N. Y. City)

Ohio
Mrs. Valentine Winters
319 West 1st St., Dayton

Oklahoma
Miss Ida F. Hasley
Lee Huckins Hotel
Oklahoma City

Oregon
Mrs. W. J. Hawkins
571 Myrtle St.
Portland

Pennsylvania
Miss Mary Ingham
213 Penfield Bldg., Philadelphia

South Carolina
Mrs. W. P. Vaughan
P. O. Box 792
Greenville

South Dakota
Mrs. A. R. Fellows
Sioux Falls

Tennessee
Miss Sue White
Jackson

Texas
Mrs. Clara Snell Wolfe
909 West 18th Street
Austin

Utah
Mrs. Louise Garnett
125 P St., Salt Lake City

Virginia
Mrs. Sophie G. Meredith
204 East Grace St., Richmond

Washington
Mrs. Frederick Forest
2417 Pacific Ave., Spokane

West Virginia
Mrs. U. A. Vincent
Shinnston

Wisconsin
Miss Ada James
Richland Center

National Advisory Council

Chairman, Mrs. John Rogers, Jr., N. Y.

Vice Chairmen
Miss Susan P. Frost, S. C.
Mrs. Edwin C. Grice, Pa.
Mrs. Alden Potter, Minn.
Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, D. C.

Secretary, Mrs. George H. Day, Conn.

Miss Ella Abeel, Ill.
Mrs. Frederick T. Ackerman, N. Y.
Mrs. Robert Adamson, N. Y.
Mrs. W. R. Alvord, Mich.
Mrs. Charles E. Amidon, N. Dak.
Mrs. W. D. Ascough, Mich.
Miss Mary E. Bakewell, Pa.
Mrs. M. R. Bankston, La.
Mrs. Bion H. Barnett, Fla.
Mrs. Cyrus Beard, Wyo.
Mrs. M. Toscan Bennett, Conn.
Mrs. Orlow Black, California
Mrs. William Blauvelt, N. Y.
Mrs. Howard P. Boyle, Ohio
Mrs. Alfred H. Bright, Minn.
Reverend Olympia Brown, Wis.
Mrs. W. G. Brown, W Va.
Mrs. Henry Bruere, N. Y.
Mrs. Robert Bruere, D. C.
Miss Mary A. Burnham, Pa.
Mrs. Dora Phelps Buell, Col.
Mrs. Annie Wells Cannon, Utah
Mrs. John Carey, Ind.
Mrs. Joseph Carey, Wyo.
Mrs. Elinor Carlisle, Cal.
Mrs. Thomas L. Chadbourne, N. Y.
Mrs. Margaret Zane Cherdron, Utah
Mrs. Ross A. Collins, Miss.
Mrs. William L. Colt, N. Y.
Miss Anna Constable, N. Y.
Mrs. Vincent Cook, Ore.
Mrs. Frank Cothren, N. Y.
Mrs. R. P. Crump, Miss.
Mrs. Lucius M. Cuthbert, Col.
Dr. Maria M. Dean, Mont.
Miss Lavinia Dock, Pa.
Mrs. Rheta Childe Dorr, N. Y.
Mrs. Victor du Pont, Delaware
Miss Crystal Eastman, N. Y.
Mrs. John C. Edwards, Mass.
Mrs. Henry Ess, Mo.
Mrs. J. Bordon Estee, Vt.
Mrs. Sara Bard Field, Cal.
Mrs. Robert Patterson Finley, N. J.
Mrs. William Floyd, N. Y.
Mrs. Marie Moore Forrest, D. C.
Mrs. J. Andre Fouilhoux, Ore.
Mrs. L. Crozier French, Tenn.
Mrs. Emma Maddox Funck, Md.
Mrs. Mary Garbutt, Cal.
Mrs. Susan Lawrence Gehrman, Ill.
Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, N. Y.
Mrs. Adolphus E. Graupner, Cal.
Mrs. Jennie Law Hardy, Mich.
Mrs. W. E. Hardy, Neb.
Mrs. F. R. Hazard, N. Y.
Mrs. William Randolph Hearst, N. Y.
Mrs. George Hendrie, Mich.
Mrs. Elon Huntington Hooker, N. Y.
Mrs. Henry E. Hovey, N. H.
Mrs. Frederick C. Howe, N. Y.
Mrs. Inez Haynes Irwin, N. Y.
Mrs. Agnes Jenks, R. I.
Mrs. Adelaide Johnson, N. Y.
Miss Marie Ernst Kennedy, Pa.
Mrs. Charles Gilmore Kerley, N. Y.
Dr. Cora Smith King, Wash.
Miss Fola La Follette, N. Y.
Miss Gail Laughlin, Cal.
Mrs. Samuel A. Lindsay, Tex.
Dr. Sarah H. Lockrey, Pa.
Miss Marian May, N. Y.
Mrs. Lillian M. McAdow, N. Y.
Mrs. John E. McCall, Tenn.
Miss Belle McGibeny, N. J.
Miss Bernice McCoy, Idaho
Mrs. Benton MacKaye, D. C.
Miss Hazel MacKaye, Mass.
Mrs. Ida Finney Mackrille, Cal.
Mrs. Lionel S. Marks, Mass.
Mrs. Marcus M. Marks, N. Y.
Miss Julia Marlowe, N. Y.
Miss Helen Marot, N. Y.
Miss Edythe Wynne Matthison, Conn.
Mrs. Cyrus Mead, Ohio
Miss Vida Milholland, N. Y.
Miss Katherine A. Morey, Mass.
Mrs. John T. Morrison, Idaho
Mrs. Henry Moskowitz, N. Y.
Mrs. William Spencer Murray, Md.
Mrs. Mary Nolan, Fla.
Mrs. Fremont Older, Cal.
Mrs. Marsden Perry, R. I.
Mrs. Horton Pope, Colorado
Mrs. Annie G. Porritt, Conn.
Mrs. W. H. Ridenbaugh, Idaho
Mrs. James M. Rector, Ohio
Mrs. Isaac Reese, Tenn.
Miss Ella Riegel, Pa.
Mrs. Julius Rosenwald, Ill.
Mrs. A. S. Rossin, N. Y.
Mrs. Charles Edward Russell, D. C.
Mrs. Frederick Sanborn, Cal.
Mrs. Townsend Scott, Md.
Mrs. Samuel Shields, Tenn.
Mrs. Eugene Shippen, Mich.
Mrs. Frances Thurber Seal, N. Y.
Mrs. Mary Wright Sewall, Ind.
Mrs. Austin Sperry, Cal.
Mrs. Albert Steinfeld, Ariz.
Mrs. Julius Stone, Ohio
Miss Grace Strachan, N. Y.
Mrs. David D. Terry, Ark.
Mrs. Mary C. Therkelson, Ore.
Mrs. Robert Gibbes Thomas, S. C.
Mrs. W. I. Thomas, Ill.
Miss Clara L. Thompson, Mo.
Mrs. William B. Thompson, N. Y.
Mrs. Shelley Tolhurst, Cal.
Mrs. Samuel Untermeyer, N. Y.
Mrs. J. P. Vollmer, Idaho
Mrs. Hattie D. M. Wallis, Col.
Mrs. Thomas F. Walsh, D. C.
Mrs. Adeline Otero Warren, N. M.
Mrs. James Whittemore, Mich.
Dr. Marion Walker Williams, Ariz.
Miss Fannie Witherspoon, Miss.
Mrs. F. L. Woodward, Colo.
Mrs. Pope Yeatman, Pa.
Mrs. S. B. M. Young, Mont.
Mrs. Fanny Bloomfield Zeisler, Ill.

National Departments

Headquarters Maintenance Committee
Mrs. William Kent

Finance
Mrs. Lawrence Lewis

Lobby
Miss Maud Younger

Legislative
Miss Doris Stevens

State Legislative Chairmen
N. Y.—Mrs. Wilmer Kearns
(Greater New York)
Mrs. Wm. H. Blauvelt
(up state)
Pa. —Miss Marie Ernst Kennedy

Political
Mrs. Abby Scott Baker

Press
Mrs. Florence Brewer Boeckel

State Press Chairmen
Colorado—Mrs. Iris Calderhead Walker
Connecticut—Mrs. Annie G. Porritt
Delaware—Mrs. Mary E. Brown
Georgia—Miss Eleanor Raoul
Illinois—Miss Lucy Ewing
New Hampshire—Mrs. Lillian Ainsworth
New Mexico—Miss Bertha Becker
Maine—Mrs. Madaleine Louis Freeman
Pennsylvania—Miss Caroline Katzenstein
South Carolina—Miss Mabel Pollitzer
Texas—Miss Ruby Black
Virginia—Miss J. S. Jennings

National Organizers

Miss Lucy Branham
Miss Mary Dubrow
Miss Julia Emory
Miss Catherine M. Flanagan
Miss Betty Gram
Miss Elsie Hill
Miss Caroline Katzenstein
Mrs. Charles F. Moller
Miss Vivian Pierce
Miss Anita Pollitzer
Miss Margaret Whittemore

Notes of the Week

Woman Puts Through First Equal Pay Law

THE Public reports the following item from Montana:

"To the 'Lady from Racalli,' Maggie Smith Hathaway, Montana legislator, belongs the credit for having this year introduced into a legislature distinctly unfavorable to labor, and having pushed through to success, the first equal pay law in the United States. In pushing her bill she placed on each state senator's desk literature carrying the following points: 'A woman who does the same amount of work as a man should have the same pay'; 'Quality and quantity of work, not sex, should be the basis of compensation': 'Low-paid woman labor compares unfairly with men's labor'; 'Women teachers in Montana earn for like work from $126 to $376 less than men.'"

Women Policemen

THERE are now twenty-eight women on the New York city police force. The women do not wear uniforms like the women policemen in London. They will act in the capacity of guardians of juvenile morals at dance halls, picnics, moving picture shows and, as the report says, "in all places where there is danger to the young." The women may use the same equipment as policemen. Their salary will be $1,200 a year.

The Texas Referendum

THE first reports from Texas that the suffrage referendum in that state had been victorious are now contradicted and the indications are that suffrage has lost by a few thousand majority. All districts of the state have not yet been heard from so there is still a chance that this state can be put in the full suffrage column before all the backward states are included by the federal amendment.

Another Canadian Province for Suffrage

THE legislature of Yukon has passed an act extending the franchise to women in all territorial elections on full equality with men and has furthermore asked the Canadian federal government to grant similar rights to women in federal elections.

Women in the Episcopal Church

ACCORDING to the existing rules of the Protestant Episcopal Church no woman in the church may bring charges against a minister or a bishop. Charges for any sort of improper conduct on the part of the clergyman must be made "by ten or more male communicants of this church in good standing, of whom at least two shall be presbyters." An effort will be made at the general convention of the church to be held next fall to abolish this regulation and to give women all the rights which men have in the church. One of the leaders of the movement to secure recognition for women by the church is Mrs. A. E. Clark, of Oregon. Mrs. Clark tried first to secure full laity rights for women in the Episcopal Church of her own state.

Swedish Women Win Suffrage Before Americans

THE Swedish suffrage bill, so long delayed by the Conservatives of the First Chamber, has finally been passed by large majorities in both houses of the Riksdag. It has been extremely difficult to secure full parliamentary suffrage for women in Sweden although some women have voted there in municipal elections since 1862.

At the present time there are women members of many town councils. In Stockholm there are fifteen women town councillors. Much propaganda work for suffrage has been done in Sweden by means of course of lectures paid for by the late Mrs. Bergman-Osterberg. It is estimated that 23,590 persons have taken these courses.

Union of Women in Spain

THERE has existed in Spain for nearly a year a feminist society organized under the name of the Union of the Women of Spain. The society is working for the education of Spanish women, the improvement of their economic status, and the obtaining of private, civil, and political rights for them equal to the ones which men enjoy. There is a great deal to be done along these lines in Spain since married women have not control of their property nor control of their children. There is at present almost no provision for the education of Spanish girls in any class of society.

The Union of the Women of Spain is working along the usual propaganda lines, organizing branches and meetings, distributing literature and arranging educational courses for women. The president of the society is the Marquesa del Ter.

Filipino Women Meet

NEARLY four hundred women representatives of the women's clubs of the Philippines met recently and passed resolutions showing a very up to date stand on the part of the women. The resolutions included one recommending to the legislature the establishment of a woman's bureau, with women directors, to handle women's work in the islands; another endorsing the payment of a living wage to teachers; a resolution to grant free medical attention to school children; a resolution endorsing prohibition, social hygiene movements, and equal opportunities for women.

Korean Women Plead for Help

A GROUP of women in the Hawaian Islands organized as the Korean Girls' League have sent a circular letter to women in this country urging the help of American women in the struggle of the Koreans for liberty. The letters says of conditions in Korea, "Soldiers have cut off the hands of school girls for holding up manifestos. Women have been stripped, beaten in the streets, then imprisoned and further tortured."

The letter concludes, "Will you not, ladies and friends, sympathize with us, and help up to obtain our freedom? Will you not give some sort of expression to the government officials of your country and to the public? Do pray for us, friends, that we may secure the liberty of Korea."

It is signed by Soomie Choy, the president of the society.

Eight Hour Day in France

THE French Senate has ratified the bill already voted upon by the Chamber of Deputies, providing for an eight hour day and a forty-eight hour week for both men and women.

Unemployment in Great Britain

ACCORDING to reports received in this country recently there are nearly a million women unemployed in Great Britain at the present time. It was estimated that 1,200,000 more women were working in various industries during the war than before. It now appears that a number almost as large as this has been put out of employment. The negotiation officer of the Federation of Women Workers, Miss Madeline Symons, says that while Government figures show half a million women receiving out-of-work benefits there are twice as many women out of work, the balance being ineligible for benefits for various minor technical reasons.

The Ministry of Labour is working on a scheme for training these women in various trades. There will be training in such industries as clothing, laundry-work, the manufacture of foods, paper, stationery, and the textile trades. The courses of training will consume on an average about three months and will be given in employers' works, in technical trade schools, and in government instructional factories. The women attending the courses will be given the unemployment grant they now receive, ranging from fifteen to twenty-five shillings a week and an additional ten shillings if the woman must live away from home while receiving instruction.

THE NATIONAL SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following articles be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which when ratified by three-fourths of the said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

"ARTICLE—SEC. 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

THE AMENDMENT IN THE 66th CONGRESS

Introduced

In the Senate

May 20, 1919, by Senators Jones of New Mex., Johnson of Calif., Jones of Wash., and Poindexter of Wash.

In the House

May 19, 1919, by Representatives Mann of Ill., Mondell of Wyo., Taylor of Colo., Blanton of Tex., French of Idaho, and Raker of Calif.

Reported from Committee

In the House

Favorably May 20, 1919

In the Senate

Favorably May 29, 1919.

Voted Upon

In the House

May 21, 1919, yeas 304, nays 89, passing by 42 over necessary two-thirds majority.

HISTORY OF THE AMENDMENT

Drafted

In its present form, by Susan B. Anthony in 1875.

First Introduced

January 10, 1878, by Hon. A. A. Sargent, in the Senate.

Reported from Committee

In the Senate

1878, Adverse majority.
1879, Favorable minority.
1882, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1884, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1886, Favorable majority.
1890 Favorable majority.
1892, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1896, Adverse majority.
1913, Favorable majority.
1914, Favorable majority.
1917, Favorable majority.
1919, Unanimously favorably.

In the House

1883, Favorable majority.
1884, Adverse majority, favorable minority.
1886, Favorable minority.
1890, Favorable majority.
1894, Adverse majority.
1914, Without recommendation.
1916, Without recommendation.
1917, Without recommendation.
1918, Favorable majority.
1919, Favorable majority.

Voted Upon

In the Senate

January 25, 1887. Yeas 16, nays 34. Absent 25 (of whom 4 were announced as for and 2 against).

March 19, 1914. Yeas 35, nays 34, failing by 11 of the necessary two-thirds vote.

October 1, 1918, yeas 54, nays 30, failing by 2 of the two-thirds vote.

February 10, 1919, yeas 55, nays 29, failing by one of the necessary two- thirds vote.

In the House

January 12, 1915. Yeas 174, nays 204, failing by 78 of the necessary two-thirds vote.

Passed January 10, 1918, by one vote over necessary two-thirds majority.

Passed May 21, 1919. Yeas 304, nays 89, passing by 42 votes over necessary two-thirds majority.

The Suffragist

JUNE 7, 1919 VOL. VII. No. 22

Issued Weekly by National Woman's Party

14 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

Editor, Sue S. White

Contributing Art Editors

Nina E. Allender
Cornelia Barns

Circulation Committee

California—Mrs. Alice Park
Colorado—Mrs. Charlotte Dinwiddie
Florida—Miss Ruby Leach
Illinois—Mrs. Alfred Linton
Indiana—Mrs. M. B. Spellman
Iowa—Miss Blanche Robbins
Louisiana—Mrs. Alice Cosu
Massachusetts—Mrs. Stephen Chase
Michigan—Mrs. James Whittemore
Minnesota—Miss Nettie Blasing
New Jersey—Mrs. Marguerite Washington
New Mexico—Mrs. Emily R. LaBelle
Ohio—Mrs. Mary D. Brite
Pennsylvania—Mrs. Edwin C. Grice
Tennessee—Mrs. C. A. Dickey
Wisconsin—Mrs. F. T. Andrea

Subscriptions: Domestic, $1.00; Foreign, $1.50. Single copies 5 cents. Make checks, drafts, and post-office orders payable to The Treasurer of the National Woman's Party

Columbian Printing Company, Inc., Washington, D. C.

Entered as second-class matter, Nov. 14, 1913, at the Postoffice at Washington, D. C., under act of March 3,1879

A New Task

THIS number of The Suffragist marks the close of one chapter and heralds the beginning of a new chapter in suffrage history. The forms are closed and it goes to press simultaneously with the opening of the debate upon the Susan B. Anthony amendment in the Senate of the 66th Congress—a debate which, it is expected, will be the last suffrage debate in Congress, and which, it is expected, will close with the passage of the amendment.

IT is being pointed out by suffrage leaders that one day's delay in the passage of the amendment may mean a year's delay in ratification, due to legislatures adjourning. It is hoped that there will be no further efforts to filibuster, and that the time consumed in debate will be reduced to the minimum, and the responsibility for any delay that may be caused by filibustering fixed upon the party who permits it.

AS we turn from the task of getting the amendment through Congress to the task of ratification, it is with confidence of success, but also it must be with a realization that ratification will cost a great deal in continued effort and sacrifice. Thirty-six state legislatures must be won. Some of them must be called into special session if ratification is to be accomplished with expedition. Work which has been more or less centralized must be extended into every legislative district in every state, and in order to speedily accomplish its purpose, it must be done quickly and intensively.

UNTIL the 36th state has ratified, it can not be said that the task is completed. Suffragists who think of taking a vacation from suffrage work at this time should understand that to do so would be breaking faith with the cause when it needs them most.

Preliminaries in the Senate

ALTHOUGH opponents of the suffrage amendment conceded that it would pass when brought to a vote, they persisted in a what might be termed a filibuster which prolonged the deliberations for several days, disclaiming all the while, according to Senator Hoke Smith, of Georgia, (Democrat) "any purpose of delaying action upon the proposed constitutional amendment."

On Friday, May 23, after Senator Underwood, of Alabama, (Democrat) had prevented the consideration of the suffrage resolution which had come from the House, by raising an objection to a request for unanimous consent to have it read twice and placed on the calendar without referring to the Committee, as detailed in last week's Suffragist, Senator Jones, of Washington (Republican) made a motion "to discharge the Committee on Woman Suffrage from the further consideration of the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women." The effect of this motion would have been to place the resolution proposing the amendment, upon the calendar of the Senate for immediate consideration. Under the rules of the Senate, it was necessary for the motion to discharge the committee to lie over for a day, and accordingly it was called up on Monday morning, May 26, by Senator Watson, of Indiana, (Republican) who since that time has been made chairman of the Woman Suffrage Committee.

The parliamentary tactics of the opposition were begun immediately by Senator Smith, of Georgia, raising a point of order. His first contention was that the motion was not formally made on Friday. Gaining nothing from this, except a few moments delay, the next contention of the opposition was that the question should come up under resolutions and not under reports of committees. It developed that they were fighting for time in order to keep the motion from coming to a vote before two o'clock in the afternoon, when a special order had been set on a motion to refer a resolution to the Foreign Relations Committee, the debate of which would involve a discussion of the League of Nations. Every time killing technicality of parliamentary proceeding was resorted to and the hour of two o'clock finally arrived with the motion to discharge the Woman Suffrage Committee still pending. Several speeches were made upon various points raised, and the formality of calling the roll was gone through with six times, three times to see if a quorum were present, once on a motion to table, once on an amendment, and once on an appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Senator Jones, of New Mexico (Democrat), who by virtue of being chairman of the Woman Suffrage Committee in the last Congress held over until the new Committee was appointed, supported the motion to discharge the Committee. He said: "I think it is proper, before the motion is put, to state what the Committee on Woman Suffrage did on Saturday. I presented the question to the Senate on last Friday, as to the authority and duty of the committee. Under the resolution adopted at the last session of Congress, all the old committees were continued in power and authority, and likewise were subjected to the burdens and duties of whatever matters might properly be referred to the committees. After that announcement was made here on Friday I felt that I was under obligations, at least, to relieve myself of any duty that might devolve upon that committee, and therefore I called a meeting of the committee for Saturday morning last.

"We had a meeting of the committee. Of course, I recognized the delicate situation with respect to my successor on the committee, but at the same time I did not feel that I could avoid taking some action and assuming the responsibility of my position. When we met we decided that the quickest way to bring the joint resolution before the Senate for action was to favor the motion made by the Senator from the State of Washington, that the committee be discharged from its further consideration. Under the rules, if we had made a report from the committee, on objection that report would have had to lie over a day for consideration. The Senator from Washington (Mr. Jones) made this motion on Friday and let it lie over under the rule, so that it can be acted upon at this time, and representing the Committee on Woman Suffrage, I desire to support the motion of the Senator from Washington."

Senator Underwood, of Alabama, (Democrat) in opposing the motion to discharge the Woman Suffrage Committee said: "The only purpose that can be accomplished by this procedure is possibly to hasten the passage of the resolution by a day or two. I can not see, if the resolution commands a two-thirds vote, why this is necessary; and if it can not command a two-thirds vote, then there is no object to be accomplished by the motion anyway. . . . There is not a senator here who says that this committee in the new Congress has had an opportunity to consider it. It is simply adopting revolutionary tactics in the Senate in order to railroad a piece of legislation through as the very opening method of this Congress."

At this point Senator Jones, of New Mexico (Democrat) interrupted to say: "Does not the Senator from Alabama recognize the fact that the Committee on Woman Suffrage met on last Saturday and considered this question, and would not that have any bearing upon the argument which he is now presenting."

The Record continues:

"Mr. Underwood: The committee had possession of the documents, did they not?

"Mr. Jones, of New Mexico: The committee had possession of the documents; they considered the situation; and, in order to expedite the consideration of the resolution by the Senate, instead of reporting the resolution favorably, the committee decided to support the motion of the senator from Washington in order that there might not be any delay in coming to a vote upon the resolution.

"Mr. Underwood: I am always glad to listen to the Senator's arguments, and he always has sound grounds behind him. The Senator says that the Committee on Woman suffrage pursued this course in order to expedite the matter. I suppose there was a majority of the committee present?

"Mr. Jones, of New Mexico: There was."

SENATORS Underwood, Borah of Idaho, Swanson of Virginia, Reed of Missouri, Smith of Georgia, and Wadsworth of New York, on the side opposing the discharge of the Committee, and Senators Jones of New Mexico, Smoot of Utah, Watson of Indiana, and Jones of Washington, supporting the motion to discharge the Committee, discussed the technical points involved under the Senate Rules. Mr. Swanson referred to an authority called "Gilfreys' Precedents." One of the several points raised was whether or not the motion was debatable. Vice-President Marshall ruled that it was not debatable before one o'clock, and stated the question, when to kill time Senator Smith, of Georgia, "suggested the absence of a quorum," necessitating a roll call, and then moved to lay on the table, demanding the yeas and nays, necessitating the second roll call. The motion to table was lost by a vote of 64 to 27. Senator Smith then moved that the Senate take a recess until one o'clock. This was rejected and the question was again stated when Senator Smith again "suggested the absence of a quorum," necessitating another calling of the roll.

He then proposed an amendment providing that the committee be discharged at the end of three days and requested the yeas and nays—another roll call. The amendment to the motion was, of course, defeated, the vote being 63 to 24—but one o'clock had rolled around and what had not been debatable became debatable until two o'clock when another matter had been set as a special order.

"No Purpose to Delay"

IN opening the debate, Senator Smith said: "I wish to disclaim any purpose of delaying action upon the proposed constitutional amendment."

He said further: "I feel sure that the motion to discharge the committee should not have been taken up when it was, and several of us concluded that it was desirable to delay action until one o'clock in order that those of us

who had opposed the immediate consideration of the motion might have an opportunity to say briefly, not with any consumption of time that amounted in any sense to a filibuster, but merely for the purpose of making it known that we did not intend in any way to filibuster and that we did not intend in any way to unduly delay a vote upon this proposed constitutional amendment, but that we thought a few days should pass before action should be had. I have no doubt that within the week, certainly next week, we will vote on this proposed amendment. I for one shall take less than an hour, perhaps not half an hour, to say what I wish to say about the condition in my state and to express my objections to a proposed constitutional amendment which would interfere with the right of each separate state to settle this question to suit itself."

The Sooner the Better

SENATOR Williams, of Mississippi, (Democrat) who heretofore has expressed grave apprehensions as to the effect of woman suffrage said: "I do not think this question needs debating; it needs settling. It has been debated for some 20 years. Big men, little men, and middle-sized men have talked about it until the whole country is tired of hearing talk upon this subject. . . . I think the sooner we can get a vote upon this question the better. I expect to vote against this proposed constitutional amendment, but I do not want to retard its consideration. Now, the whole world—not only America, but all the world—is messed up and mussed up with every sort of important question, and this question is not of the slightest importance on the thoughts or the habits or the legislation of men or of women here or elsewhere. The trouble has been that the advocates of it have thought that the entire civilized world depended upon its passage, and the opponents of it have thought that the home life and morality of the world depended upon its defeat. The truth is that in some 11 or 12 states where for 20 years or more it has been tried, it has done neither good nor harm. So far as I am concerned, I was opposed to it, and am yet, because I think it affects to a certain extent the social fabric of the South; but I see the handwriting on the wall.

"What is the use," he asked, hitting his desk with his fist. "Those of us who are opponents of this measure who can see anything when written upon the book of fate at all can see that this is written there. The question is settled. Why not simply satisfy ourselves in voting against it, and why not benefit the country and the world by getting it to a vote just as soon as possible. I am in favor of making a fight to the last ditch when you have got a fight and making it as long as there is a scintilla of hope upon the horizon, making it as long as you think you can beat your opponents in any proper, honest, or right way. One of the proper and honest and right ways is, if you think you can defeat a proposition next week, and you can not defeat it now, to carry it over until then; but nobody believes that in this case; everybody knows it is a question of whether the thing shall come to a vote now and be passed or whether it shall come to a vote, according to the judgment of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Smith), in three days and be passed. What good will talking do? I have done my share of talking upon it privately and publicly, although I never made a stated speech about it. . . . but when two-thirds of Congress are in favor of submitting a joint resolution to the states for adoption by the usual three-fourths, and when you know beforehand that that is the case, and when you know that the country and the world have important business to attend to, and when you know that the practical results of the adoption or defeat of woman suffrage will amount to nothing, as the experience of the world whereever it has been adopted has demonstrated beyond cavil or doubt, then why should we stand here and just delay things for parliamentary advantage of one or two days or something else?

In conclusion, Senator Williams said: "There is no one in this body to whom, temperamentally and sectionally, this motion is more obnoxious; but my ancestors have been through this temperamental and sectional opposition once before, and when they found out that the game was lost no less men than Robert E. Lee and Joseph E. Johnston and other great men said, 'We will not carry on a war by ambush. When we have lost the last regular battle that we can lose, and the last regular army that we have, we will quit, and we will make peace in good faith, and we will keep it in good faith.' I am sorry that it is written upon the book of fate, but it is written there. Now, let us face the situation, and go down in honor, as we do in defeat, which we can not help. Let us not spend any time trying to get three or four more days to talk in."

Senator Borah Has "Reasons"

"I HAD expected to submit some reasons why I shall vote against the joint resolution," said Senator Borah, of Idaho, "and I shall be brief in doing so. If an arrangement may be had so that we may proceed in an orderly but expeditious way to final submission of the question, giving those who have not yet been converted to the program an opportunity to state their reasons, so far as I am concerned, they may proceed. I have not changed my view; and while anything said here will not change a vote, I nevertheless, for reasons satisfactory to myself, would like to make some observations."

Opposes Precedent

SENATOR Gore, of Oklahoma, (Democrat) opposed the motion to discharge the Woman Suffrage Committee on the ground that he did not like "to have a revolutionary procedure established so early in the session, just after the change in the control of the Senate—a revolutionary method which might hereafter be invoked as a precedent, and to which there might hereafter be universal objection on this (the Democratic) side."

Senator Simmons, of North Carolina, (Democrat) said: "I feel with reference to this matter as the Senator from Oklahoma has expressed himself."

The Committee's Jurisdiction

"I WILL not vote to take a measure from a committee which does not exist," said Senator Fall, of New Mexico, (Republican). According to my interpretation of the joint resolution, the committee had no jurisdiction of this measure at all, and has not had the joint resolution in its hands; and therefore a motion to discharge it should not be entertained."

To this Senator Jones, of New Mexico, replied: The Committee on Woman Suffrage met and considered this very situation and decided to support this motion; so the committee has considered this joint resolution, which came from the House, proposing the amendment, and it has decided to take this course in order to bring the matter to a vote in the Senate. It is a joint resolution which had been before the Senate and the country for a generation, and no one can say that he has not had an opportunity to consider it fully. When the committee charged with the duty of considering the joint resolution decides to bring it before the Senate in this way, I can not understand how any one can claim that it has not had consideration, that it is revolutionary, or that it sets any bad precedent. The committee has considered it time after time, brought it to a vote before the Senate at least twice during the last Congress, and it is the same thing, the same committee; and can any one say that to recommend this procedure is revolutionary?"

Two o'Clock Arrives

At this point Senator Hitchcock, of Nebraska, (Democrat) suggested the absence of a quorum and the roll was called again. With the motion to discharge the Woman Suffrage Committee still pending, two o'clock had arrived when the special order had the right of way. Senator Watson, of Indiana, asked unanimous consent that the special order be temporarily laid aside until the woman suffrage motion was disposed of. Senator Fletcher, of Florida, (Democrat) objected. Senator Johnson, (of California) said that he had no objection if the suffrage matter was to be concluded within a brief period, but that he did not want the particular matter which was now the unfinished business to be supplanted indefinitely. Senator Fletcher would not withdraw his objection to temporarily lay aside the unfinished business in order to get a vote on the motion to discharge the suffrage committee.

On Wednesday, May 28, Senator Watson, the Chairman of the new committee on Woman Suffrage, asked consent to report the resolution and to take up the discussion on Tuesday, June 3, 1919, and make it a continuing order until it shall have been finally disposed of. The consent-agreement asked for by Senator Watson read:

"It is agreed by unanimous consent that immediately upon the conclusion of the routine morning business on the calendar day of Tuesday, June 3, 1919, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of House joint resolution 1, joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women, and will continue such consideration to the exclusion of other business until its final disposition."

This was objected to by Senator Reed, of Missouri, (Democrat) who said: "I have not the slightest disposition to delay a vote on this joint resolution. I think I shall want to take 10 or 15 minutes in a mere statement of my personal position; but I do object to an agreement which puts this matter down for consideration to the exclusion of all other business, that agreement being a unanimous-consent agreement, which we can not escape from when we have once made it. I will not object to this matter being made the unfinished business, and I assure the Senator from Indiana that there will be no dilatory tactics on my part."

Senator Watson then stated that he would give notice on the morrow (Thursday) that he would take it up on Monday (June 2).

Senators Gay and Underwood Introduce Amendments

ON Thursday, May 29, Senator Gay, of Louisiana, (Democrat) introduced an amendment of his own, which was referred to the Woman Suffrage Committee. It differs from the Susan B. Anthony amendment only in the second section, which reads: "The several states shall have the exclusive right to enact appropriate legislation to enforce the provisions of this article." This is the same amendment introduced by Senator Gay in the last days of the 65th Congress, but which it was thought he had abandoned, since he stated, after its introduction in that Congress that he would vote for the Jones amendment at that time, which was different in its provisions from that which Senator Gay himself had introduced. Of course every amendment that is introduced delays the passage of the original Susan B. Anthony amendment, and amendments are often resorted to simply for the purpose of delaying action on an original proposition. If the Senate should amend the resolution as it passed the House of Representatives, it would mean even further delay in having to be again put to a vote there, and may necessitate special sessions of state legislatures whose regular sessions are drawing to a close, if ratification is to be accomplished before the 1920 election.

Another amendment was introduced by Senator Underwood on Monday, June 2, providing for ratification by popular conventions in three-fourths of the states.

Tuesday, June 3, is Date Set

SENATOR Watson, Chairman of the Woman Suffrage Committee, gave notice on Thursday that after the routine morning business on Tuesday, June 3, he would call up House joint resolution No. 1—the Susan B. Anthony amendment—and would insist upon pressing it to final disposition.

This announcement brought to a close the preliminary skirmishing in the Senate. As this issue of The Suffragist goes to press, the stage is set for the final passage of the amendment on Tuesday, or as soon as the opposing senators will permit it to be brought to a vote.

Democratic National Committee Urges Special Sessions of Legislatures for Ratification

A RESOLUTION was passed by the Democratic National Committee at the close of a two days session in Chicago on May 29, calling on the legislatures of the various states to hold special sessions, if necessary, to ratify the woman suffrage constitutional amendment when passed by Congress, so as to enable women to vote in the Presidential election in 1920.

THERE are a number of legislatures meeting soon where the Democratic Party is in absolute control, and others that can be called in special session for ratification if the Democratic National Committee really acts upon the resolution it has adopted. All the Southern states are Democratic, and the Democratic National Committee is not without power or effective means to facilitate ratification, if the resolution referred to was adopted as a course of action and not merely as an empty political enunciation.

The resolution came after a statement by Mrs. Percy V. Pennybacker, of Texas, speaking for the women associate members of the Committee, to the effect that the Democratic Congress made a blunder when it failed to adopt the woman suffrage constitutional amendment, and that the Committee should admit it. Anticipating the passage of the Susan B. Anthony amendment by the Sixty-sixth Congress, she suggested that the Democratic National Committee call upon the state legislatures to convene in special session to ratify the amendment.

THE Committee also, according to press despatches, adopted a declaration offered by P. H. Keen, National Committeeman from Rhode Island, which reviewed the achievements that will be claimed by the Democrats in the 1920 campaign. Among other things this statement says:

"As the first national political organization to record itself in favor of woman suffrage, and as the first to welcome the women into full participation in party councils, we deplore and condemn the dilatory tactics of the Republican Party in the closing hours of the last session of Congress, which resulted in the failure of the suffrage resolution at a time when its proponents were assured of the requisite number of votes to accomplish its passage."

The mere quotation of the above statement is not an admission of the verity of its contents. There may be other political organizations claiming to be national in their scope which may also have statements of a similar nature, and which may have some grounds upon which to base an attempt to discredit the chain made by the Democratic National Committee that that party was the first to record itself in favor of woman suffrage; or which may possibly undertake to refute the charge of dilatory tactics. However, this may be, the question which suffragists are most interested in after the passage of the amendment, is how soon ratification may be accomplished.

The Democratic National Committee has taken a forward step in passing the resolution calling upon leigislatures to hold special sessions for ratification.

Ratification Before 1920

By Annie G. Porritt, Press Chairman Connecticut Branch, National Woman's Party.

THE Hartford Post, in a recent editorial hit the nail on the head when it stated that "It is just as well for Connecticut to get accustomed to the idea that the demand for early ratification will be just as insistent as the demand for the passage of the resolution. And if the women are to have the vote, there is no reason why they should be asked to wait three years before they get a chance to use it." There will certainly be an insistent and vigorous demand for ratification through the calling of extra sessions of the state legislatures, and it is a demand for which there are many excellent reasons in addition to those mentioned in the editorial from which I have quoted.

IN addition to the strong desire of the women of the minority of states which have not granted either full suffrage, primary suffrage or presidential suffrage, that they should not be excluded from voting for President in 1920 when the majority of their sisters will enjoy that right, there is a further reason that apparently appeals to the opponents of suffrage quite as much as to the suffragists themselves. This is that the present condition is full of anomalies and of possibilities of political confusion.

Some time ago opponents to suffrage called attention to these possibilities. It was pointed out that there were several states in which Presidential suffrage had been granted to women under circumstances which make possible the calling in question of the constitutionality of the law. The law cannot be decided in the courts until after it has been tested, and it cannot be tested until occasion comes for it to be put into operation. In other words neither the friends nor the enemies of woman suffrage can tell what the decision of the court will be until after the election of 1920 has been held.

However, the election of 1920 may result, it is quite certain that many people will be displeased and discontented with it. It will be open to these disgruntled politicians to try to upset the election by calling in question the right of the women to vote. It is very possible that the women voters in some of the states where they enjoy only presidential suffrage may have it in their power to decide the vote of the state, and consequently—as in the case of California in 1916—the fate of the whole election. If then the laws are carried to the state supreme court, and afterwards perhaps to the Supreme Court of the United States, there would ensue uncertainty and confusion that would extend over a period of months.

THE argument in bringing forward this contingency was that it was unwise to grant presidential suffrage and that those presidential suffrage laws already passed ought to be repealed. However, as the state legislatures persisted in passing more presidential suffrage laws and in not repealing any already passed, another way out of the difficulty is suggested by the suffragists. This is to ratify the Susan B. Anthony amendment before 1920 and thus end forever and completely all doubt concerning the right of women to vote for President, by giving them equal rights with men in all elections.

THE states where there would be most likelihood of contest are Vermont, Indiana, North Dakota, Wisconsin, Missouri, Minnesota, and Iowa. In Vermont the contest would arise because the Governor vetoed the presidential suffrage bill. It is claimed by the supporters of the bill that the Governor had no right under the United States Constitution to intervene in a matter which was definitely committed to the legislature alone, and that the veto is therefore null.

In North Dakota and Wisconsin, the legislatures took advantage of the right conferred on them by the United States Constitution in spite of a clause in the state constitutions which provides that all laws restricting or extending the right of suffrage shall be submitted to a vote of all the electors at a general election.

In Indiana, Minnesota, Missouri and Iowa the state constitutions define the electors at all elections by the people as being "male." This provision was invoked in Indiana to upset the law passed in 1917 which would have granted to the women of Indiana not only presidential suffrage but also the right to vote in all municipal and county elections—the right similar to that enjoyed by the women of Illinois. The law was contested so far as the municipal suffrage was concerned. It could not be tested in regard to presidential suffrage, because no presidential election has been held since 1917.

THE decision of the court was adverse to the right to confer municipal suffrage on women. The courts held that the legislature had no right to extend the right of franchise to persons not included within the definition of the constitution—namely "male persons." The right of the legislature to confer presidential suffrage is, however, based, not on the state constitution but on the Constitution of the United States, and only the United States Supreme Court is competent to pass finally on the constitutionality of a presidential suffrage law. The legislature therefore in 1919 passed a more limited law, giving only presidential suffrage to the women, and this law, like those of Minnesota, Missouri and Iowa, cannot be tested until the time comes for them to put into operation in November 1920. Before then all such possibilities of confusion should be swept away by the ratification of the federal suffrage amendment.

"Stand Together" Says Mrs. Clark

THAT there should be no disintegration of forces after the passage of the amendment was the key-note of the latest of the public meetings that have been held at National Headquarters under the auspices of the District of Columbia Branch

Mrs. Champ Clark was the chief speaker and made a strong plea for the solidarity of American women in the work that lies at hand. She said: "In anticipation of the victory for suffrage, we can think more about those things that we have never really forgotten in our suffrage work—those things that have lent such fine inspiration to the work for suffrage—the things that appeal to the great heart of womankind, the things that we have wanted to do, but could not do, without a full participation in government. And above all," she said, "I would charge you to stand as one in remembering the price, the human price, that is paid for war; the suffering, the sorrow, the millions of men that are mutilated and killed, crippled and mangled, every one of them some woman's son. In this, all women have a common interest, a common understanding, even though they may differ upon other subjects—perhaps upon the importance of the ballot or upon the methods of carrying forward the work to obtain the ballot. Those differences are all but settled now," she said, "and it is for the women of America to come together as one body, in a spirit of good will and tolerance, and work out the problems that face them as women."

The meeting was presided over by Mrs. William Kent, who, besides Mrs. Clark, introduced General Anson Mills, Miss Mary Dubrow and other speakers in an informal discussion of prospects and plans for ratification.

Mrs. Kate Boechk, of Washington, and Mrs. Clement Evans Dunbar, of Augusta, Georgia, presided at the tea table.

The Louisiana Branch

ONE of the Southern states that is coming to the front in suffrage organization is Louisiana, due, in part, to the keen interest that has been felt in Senator Gay's position and to the conquest of New Orleans by the Prison Special.

ALTHOUGH the announcement of the 66 votes pledged, assured passage in the Senate, the women of Senator Gay's state still felt their responsibility to win another vote in that quarter. They showed a gain of one vote in the House on May 21, which was the first vote that had been cast in the House of Representatives from a Louisiana delegation. This gain, together with the fact that Senator Gay showed signs of coming into the suffrage fold at a very critical time last March encouraged them to keep "pegging" along," even after the crisis had passed. One of the many fine things about southern suffragists is the way they keep on working for what some of them call "the redemption of our own." The prospect of the amendment's passage seems to have been not the most that they desired, as long as they felt, incidentally, a great anxiety as to the South's share in its passage; and they proudly proclaimed every gain made, insisting all the while that those gains should not be grudgingly given, but generously conceded in response to a popular demand that could not be ignored.

Senator Gay's suffrage constituents looked to him to make further progress and to cast his vote for the amendment as was shown by a mammoth petition presented to him last week by Mrs. Lee Benoist of New Orleans. He was urged to declare himself in favor of the amendment before the general elections last November, and from that time on, until

Mrs. C. A. Meissner, Vice-Chairman, Louisiana Branch

Mrs. E. J. Graham, Chairman Louisiana Branch

the adjournment of the Sixty-fifth Congress, an active campaign was conducted in Louisiana with national organizers of the Woman's Party, Miss Vivian Pierce and Miss Mary Dubrow, in charge. The Prison Special reached New Orleans the latter part of February, and was greeted by an open air mass meeting of several thousand people who voiced their impatience with the obstruction of the Senators who were holding out against the amendment at that time.

Senator Ransdell, who is Senator Gay's senior colleague, has been an ardent supporter of the amendment. They represent the same people, and are members of the same party, and that they should be at variance upon a question of such vital importance to their party at this time, certainly could never be explained upon the ground of any difference in constituents or conditions. Perhaps some people would accept the explanation of a difference in the conception of what constitutes party loyalty; but as all parties must be progressive in order to survive, party loyalty is being understood more and more as the element that helps one's party to keep up with the spirit of the day. This is no less true of ratification than of the passage of the amendment, and in those states known as "one party states," the responsibility for ratification will be quite definitely fixed upon the party in control. No state stands to itself in the field of national politics, however firmly entrenched the "one party" may be in its control of that particular state.

Three Louisiana women have been to prison in Washington, the first one being Mrs. Alice Cosu, of New Orleans, who was one of the pickets in 1917, Mrs. Estelle Elwyard, of New Shreveport.

MRS. E. J. Graham, of New Orleans, Chairman of the Louisiana Branch, as a Southern woman, is true to type, and as a suffragist, is true to her cause—which does not bring on as great a complexity of character as those who do not understand the South may think. She is a member of the executive board of the Louisiana Federation of Women's Clubs, as chairman of the Department on Conservation; and is president of the City Federation of Women's Clubs of New Orleans, an organization of 8,000 women. She is deeply interested in securing rank for army nurses, and is chairman of the New Orleans Committee formed for that purpose.

No mention of the work in Louisiana would be complete without referring to Mrs. J. P. Bentley, of New Orleans, the news of whose recent death has reached National Headquarters. She will be remembered as being in charge of Louisiana Headquarters in New Orleans by all the members of the Prison Special at the time of their visit there. At the time of her death she was one of the Vice Chairmen of the Louisiana Branch.

Another Vice Chairman is Mrs. C. A. Meissner, who is also chairman of the Second Congressional District, and who is an efficient publicity worker. She is a staunch advocate of the federal amendment.

NEW Orleans members have been selling The Suffragist on Canal Street weekly, under the leadership of Mrs. Percy L. Luck. The State Branch is building up its organization for ratification work. The Jefferson Parish Branch was recently organized, at a meeting held in New Orleans, which greatly strengthens the state organization.

Mrs. Alice M. Cosu, Vice-Chairman Louisiana Branch

Comments of the Press

Precedent for Women

IF the advocates of woman suffrage follow up the passage of the Anthony amendment by the United States Senate with a request for a special session of the Connecticut legislature for ratification, in order that they may get a presidential vote four years earlier than would otherwise be the case they will have ample precedent for such a request.

When the troops were at the Mexican border a special session of the legislature was called to enfranchise the soldiers who were outside the state and when Connecticut soldiers went to Europe another special session was called that the fighting men might not be disfranchised. There would, then, be ample room for asking the governor to call a special session in order to speed up the granting of the ballot to women.

It can be taken for granted that special sessions will be held in many states. After fighting for 50 years for the right which will be theirs with the action of the Senate and of 36 states, the women are not likely to be willing to wait until 1921 for ratification to begin, especially when 1921 will be just too late for a presidential election.

It is just as well for Connecticut to get accustomed to the idea that the demand for early ratification will be just as insistent as the demand for passage of the resolution. And if the women are to have the vote there is no reason why they should be asked to wait three years before they get a chance to use it.—*Hartfard (Conn.) Evening Post, May 24, 1919,*

The March of Suffrage

THIS is the day of triumph for the equal suffragists. The Susan B. Anthony amendment which in the last Congress passed the House by a bare constitutional majority, was adopted by the National House of Representatives on Wednesday with seventy-one per cent of the total vote instead of two-thirds. This is followed by the announcement of Senator Hale, of Maine, who voted against suffrage, when it failed by one vote in February last, that he has changed his opinion and will vote for suffrage. . . . . There is no reasonable doubt, therefore, that the suffrage amendment will pass the Senate shortly, perhaps in time to catch some of the legislatures still holding their biennial sessions and secure a ratification before their adjournment. . . . The march of events has for some time been moving woman suffrage to its long delayed success. Ratification by the states will proceed probably no less rapidly than did the triumphant prohibition amendment.—*Philadelphia Press May 23, 1919.*

The Suffrage Amendment

IN 1916, as President Wilson stood upon the rostrum of the House of Representatives addressing a joint session of Congress, a bevy of conspiring suffragists in the gallery unfurled a gold and black banner containing this inscription: "Mr. President, how long must women wait for liberty?" The incident caused a mild sensation, though it was but one of a long series of demonstrations for the purpose of emphasizing the demand for equal suffrage.

The answer to this pertinent query was tendered by the House of Representatives when it passed the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution declaring that the right to vote "shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex." The vote was 304 to 89, 42 more than the requisite two-thirds majority, thus reflecting in a very positive manner the sentiment of the House membership. . . .

A number of representatives who were members of the last Congress reversed their position on this question and voted for it, among them Mr. Longworth, of Ohio, who frankly confessed that he had been convinced that the time had now arrived for enfranchising the women. But those who have changed their views and their votes are able to point to a distinguished precedent. It will be recalled that in his first administration President Wilson announced that he considered suffrage a state issue, and declined to make it a national question. Later he reversed his position and advocated the constitutional amendment. There will be no surprise if some senators who previously opposed suffrage will change their minds and their votes and get into line for it. "You can no more stop the wave of progression than you can roll back the sea with a broom, which was tried once," remarked Mr. Mann, of Illinois, author of the resolution.

Woman suffrage waits only the formal action of the Senate to make it an early reality, for the proponents of the movement are certain that the necessary three-fourths of the state legislatures will ratify it at their first opportunity. After all, it will be found that the opposition which delayed its enactment for so many years was due more to sentiment than to politics. Men were not generally disposed to deny the right of women to vote, but there was a very general desire to keep them aloof from contact with the harsher and less attractive phases of political campaigns. But when women recognized their rights as citizens and demanded them, they could not justly be refused, and their fight was won.—*Washington Post, May 23, 1919*

Woman Suffrage

PRESIDENT Wilson has returned promptly to the point of urging immediate enfranchisement for the American women and Congress is evidently disposed to accede speedily. The House, indeed, has made the suffrage amendment its first order of business for the session, and there is a prospect of action at once, possibly today. This, if secured, will put the question again before the Senate, where it has lain for many months without securing the necessary two-thirds vote. But changes in the Senate's personnel have occurred which, it is believed, have carried the suffrage support beyond the two-thirds point, and if the measure is pressed for early action, following its virtually assured adoption by the House, it is altogether likely that there will be approval in the upper house as well and the final submission of the amendment to the states.

That the women of America will eventually be fully enfranchised is as assured as that year will follow year. Such rapid strides have been made toward it during the past five years that further delay can only serve to intensify the demand. The country is impatient for this tardy act of justice. And so fixed is the national belief in the equity and necessity for this measure that chagrin is felt that owing to delays in Congress the amendment, if adpoted at the present session, cannot receive ratification by the necessary three-fourths of the states in season for the coming presidential election, unless special legislative sessions are called in those states where meetings are held only in the odd-numbered years.—*Washington Evening Star, May 31, 1919*

The "Credit"

IF Senator Harris, of Georgia, is to furnish the last vote needed to put through the federal suffrage amendment, the quarrel between the Republican and Democratic Parties in the future as to which deserves the credit for giving votes to women will assume new tangles and complications.—*Springfield (Mass.) Republican, May 11, 1919*

Cornelison
Millinery
515 H Street Northwest Washington, D. C.

"We Grow 'Cause We Know"

OUR composing Rooms are replete with the most fascinating and up-to-date Type Faces—all selected for the purpose of satisfying the demand of those whose tastes tend toward the better class of Printing. MAIN 4250
Columbian Printing Co., Inc.
815 14th N. W.

JOHN C. PAIGE & CO.
Insurance
65 Kilby St., Boston. 115 Broadway, N. Y.

Treasurer's Annual Report

Treasurer, Miss Mary Gertrude Fendall
National Woman's Party Headquarters, Lafayette Square, Washington, D. C.

Bank of Deposit, American Security and Trust Co., Washington, D. C.
Auditors: Marwick, Mitchell Peet & Co.

State Treasurers

California, Miss Anne Murray, 805 Garland Bldg., Los Angeles

Colorado, Mrs. L. T. Gray, 715 North Cascade Ave., Colorado Springs

Connecticut, Mrs. M. Toscan Bennett, 22 Forest St., Hartford

Delaware, Mrs. James Ginns, 1905 Boulevard, Wilmington

District of Columbia, Miss Henrietta Heinzen, 14 Jackson Place

Florida, Mrs. Edith Waas, 108 Gilmore St., Jacksonville

Idaho, Miss Dorothy Sherman Beggs, 628 North 10th St., Boise

Illinois, Mrs. Francis T. West, 4721 Greenwood Blvd., Chicago

Indiana, Mrs. E. C. Lewis, Apt. 8, Hampton Court, Indianapolis

Louisiana, Mrs. W. J. Roach, 1401 St. Charles Ave., New Orleans

Maine, Mrs. Helen M. Leonard, Carroll St., Portland

Maryland, Miss Eleanor White, 817 North Charles St., Baltimore

Massachusetts, Mrs. Robert Gorham Fuller, 9 Park St., Boston

Michigan, Mrs. F. C. Aldinger, 9 Savoy Court, Lansing

Minnesota, Mrs. Lucile R. Collins, 2748 Elliot Ave., Minneapolis

New Hampshire, Mrs. Thomas Steele, 253 Walnut St., Manchester

New Jersey, Mrs. R. M. Laird, 48 Stratford Place, Newark

New York, Mrs. Henry G. Leach, 13 East 41st St., New York City

Pennsylvania, Miss Rebecca D. Ernst, 213 Penfield Bldg., Phila.

Ohio, Mrs. Mary D. Brite, 30 Pickering Bldg., Cincinnati

Oregon, Miss Caroline Sherrer, 558 Washington Bldg., Portland

South Carolina, Miss Psyche Webster, Cloverton Farms, Route 8, Greenville

Tennessee, Mrs. Sam Young, Dixon Springs

Texas, Mrs. Lena Gardner, Fort Worth

Utah, Mrs. P. S. Witcher, 135 C Sreet., Salt Lake City

Vermont, Dr. Anna L. Kelton, Montpelier

Virginia, Mrs. W. Hill Urguhart, The Raleigh, Richmond

Wisconsin, Mrs. Carl Haessler, 719 Stowell Ave., Milwaukee

Report for 1918

Statement of Receipts and Disbursements of the National Woman's Party for the year 1918:

I have examined the attached statement of Receipts and Disbursements for the year ended December 31, 1918, and certify to their accuracy as set forth in the records of the National Woman's Party. The receipts have been checked with the lists as published in "The Suffragist" and the expenditures have been made verified in detail as actual Disbursements.

Marwick, Mitchell, Peat & Co.

Balance in American Security and Trust Co. January 1, 1918		$ 1,507.42
Collections	760.33	
Donations	83,360.92	
Interest on Account, A. S. T. Co.	20.91	
Membership Fees	689.26	
Miscellaneous and Refund	2,746.03	
Rent of Rooms at National Headquarters	4,082.52	
Sale of Supplies	151.44	
Sale of Tickets	1,004.39	
The Suffragist		
Advertising	2,760.69	
Subscriptions	3,129.06	
Sale of Papers	387.65	6,277.40
Receipts from Tea Room Refunded		200.00
Total Receipts		99,293.20
Sum Total		100,800.62
Disbursements		97,569.36
Balance in American Security and Trust Co., January 1, 1919		3,231.26
Committee for Maintenance of Headquarters (Elizabeth T. Kent)		5,124.82
Reported to National Headquarters as collected and spent by Branches:		
Colorado	$ 2,954.20	
Connecticut	4,962.19	
Delaware	1,335.00	
Illinois	1,797.04	
Maine	79.50	
Maryland	1,153.42	
Massachusetts	5,749.42	
Michigan	1,139.02	
Minnesota	1,654.55	
New Jersey	1,222.84	
New York	2,921.75	
Ohio	829.60	
Oregon	122.95	
Pennsylvania	3,311.41	
South Carolina	2.00	
Texas	396.69	
Utah	52.45	
Total collected and Spent by Branches	29,684.03	
less $1,986 transferred to National Officers, Dec. 6, 7, 8, 9, 1917,		
Grand Total		$132,116.05

EXPENDITURES

Bail (Later refunded by Police Department		$ 240.00
Conference at Washington of National Officers, Dec. 6, 7, 8, 9, 1917, (Advertising, rent of hall and theater, supper Dec. 8, reception Dec. 6, printing, stenographers, etc.		927.25
Conference of National Advisory Council, Dec. 13, 14, 15, 1918 (Advertising, costumes for pageant for mass meeting, flags, printing, rent of theater, stenographers, salary of organizers, traveling expenses of speakers)		1,797.42
Demonstrations (Court proceedings, lawyers expenses and fees, court fees, and court stenographers)		2,210.25
Traveling expenses of participants in demonstrations		741.65
Postage, taxis, newspapers, picket prison pins, printing, supplies for prisoners, banners, salary of organizers		2,373.70
Finance Department (Postage, travelling expenses of chairman, salary of stenographer, etc.		260.13
Hospitality Department (Postage, salary of hostesses at National Headquarters, hospitality at National Headquarters for participants in demonstrations, and visitors from State branches)		746.25
Legislative Department (Multigraphing letters, salaries of chairman, postage, stenographers, supplies, printing, traveling expenses, etc.)		3,971.99
Literature Department(Postage, expressage, purchase of literature, salary of literature secretary part time, etc.)		330.59
Membership Department (Postage, salaries, etc.)		842.05
Miscellaneous (refund, loans)		644.83
National Election Campaign, August, Sept., Oct., Nov., 1918. (Salaries and traveling expenses of organizers and speakers, salaries of stenographers and press assistants, advertising, expenses of meetings, printing, etc.)		6,123.93
National Executive Department (Hospitality, postage, travelling expenses, multigraphing, salary of stenographers, switchboard operators, executive secretary, supplies, telegrams, telephone)		11,673.22
National Headquarters (coal, light, rent, repairs, installing furnace, repairs in new headquarters, salaries of housekeeper and servants, supplies, etc.)		11,227.99
Organization Department—covering work in 48 states—(advertising, banners, deputations, meetings, organizing State and Congressional District Committees, postage, printing, salaries and travelling expenses of organizers and speakers, stenographers, supplies, etc.)		18,892.77
Petition Department (Multigraphing, postage, salary of typist)		124.96
Political Department (Postage, stenographers, travelling expenses of chairman, supplies, etc.)		921.50
Press Bureau (Clippings, photos, postage, salaries of chairman and assistants, typists, messenger boy, multigraphing machine, stenographers, supplies, etc.)		7,162.08
The Suffragist—Business Department (Engraving, mailing, paper, postage, printing, salaries circulation office, etc.)		15,150.57
Editorial Department (Cartoons, postage, salaries of editors, etc.)		2,251.48
Advertising Department (Postage, salary and travelling expenses of advertising manager)		833.68
Supplies (Stationery, dictaphones, postage, printing, salaries, typewriters, etc.)		4,542.48
Tea Room (Repairs, supplies, wages of servants, and money advanced at opening, partly refunded by Tea Room)		450.26
Travelling expenses (general)		239.41
Treasury Department (Auditor, postage, salaries treasurer and assistant treasurer)		2,888.92
Total of expenditures thru National Treasury		$ 97,569.36

L. STONE CO.
MODES—INEXPENSIVELY STYLISH
THIRTEEN SIX WALNUT
PHILADELPHIA

Telephone Maine 861
Brentano's
Booksellers, Engravers and Stationers
F and Twelfth Sts. Washington, D. C.

New Fashions IN SUITS, COATS, WRAPS GOWNS, DRESSES BLOUSES, MILLINERY
Paris New York Washington
Gidding Cincinnati Philadelphia
1510 H St. N. W. *Opp. Shoreham Hotel*
Superb Furs IN SCARFS, MUFFS, ETC. BELTED STOLES CAPES, COATS

West End Trust Company

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

CAPITAL and SURPLUS

$4,000,000

Receives Deposits

Acts as Executor, Administrator
Guardian, Trustee, Agent

Sells Foreign Exchange, Travelers'
Letters of Credit, Express Checks

Maintains an Up-to-date Safe Deposit
Department and a Storage
Department for trunks
and packages

Managers Real Estate, Collects Rents
etc.

Lends Money on Approved Collateral
Security

Unexcelled Flowers

Unusual Plants

Unique Imported Vases

Fancy Birds

Louise Flower Shop

1301 Connecticut Avenue
WASHINGTON

Phone Franklin { *3841* *3842* *3579*

H. Kann Sons Co.
"THE BUSY CORNER" PENNA. AVE. AT 8TH. ST.

Practical Petticoats

OF SATEEN and HEATHERBLOOM

—That will save the wear and tear of everyday use on your finer petticoats of silk or satin. They are all well made, and of good materials, and will launder well.

Sateen Petticoats, in regulation and extra sizes; the extra sizes are in flowered sateen, made with deep flounce, finished with a pleated ruffle. The regular sizes are in black, with deep pleated flounce which has a wide vandyke border in a figured effect. Choice..... **$1.69**

—**Fine Quality Sateen Petticoats,** with novelty pleated flounce, finished with narrow pleated ruffle; these are in gray, green, blue and wistaria grounds, with overdesign in black figure and colored coin spot at..... **$3.00**

—**Heatherbloom Petticoats,** made with deep flounce, fancy tucked and finished with two small ruffles, in plain colors, also a deep flounce, tucked and finished with small pleated ruffle, in green, navy, Belgian blue, rose and black.
—At the same price we have a Heatherbloom petticoat in a figured or Dresden pattern made with a deep flounce finished with small ruffles. **$2.25**

—**Extra Size Petticoats** of Heatherbloom at..... **$2.50**

—**Extra Size Petticoats** of sateen and "Liberty Loom," at

$2.00 and $3.50

Kann's—Second Floor.

Stone

1220-1222-1224 Walnut Street
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

WE ANNOUNCE A SHOWING OF

New, Original, and Distinctive Models in

WOMEN'S SPRING APPAREL

The extraordinary scarcity of woolen fabrics, and the constant increase in prices, makes early purchasing most advisable